

MINUTES

UTAH PSYCHOLOGY BOARD MEETING

May 30, 2007

**Room 475 – 4th Floor – 9:00 A.M.
Heber Wells Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84111**

CONVENED: 9:00 A.M.

ADJOURNED: 2:27 P.M.

**Bureau Manager:
Board Secretary:**

Noel Taxin
Karen McCall

Board Members Present:

Bruce N Carpenter, Ph.D.
John F. Merryweather, Ph.D.
Lori G. Buhler
Leonard J. Haas, Ph.D., Chairperson
Natalie J. Malovich, Ph.D.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:

MINUTES:

The minutes from the April 24, 2007 meeting will be read at the July 31, 2007 Board Meeting.

APPOINTMENTS:

9:20 A.M.

Laura Czajkowski, Probationary Interview

Dr. Czajkowski met for her probationary interview.

Dr. Malovich conducted the interview.

Dr. Malovich asked Dr. Czajkowski to update the Board regarding what she has been doing this last month.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that she met with Dr. King, her supervisor, and with her therapist, Robin Roberts. She stated that a report will be provided to the Board. Dr. Czajkowski stated that she has been reading more and made a bulletin. She stated that the bulletin outlines the highlights for the last five weeks.

Dr. Czajkowski stated that after the last meeting with the Board she went through things again. She stated that talking is very effective for her as opposed to reading. She stated that she believes she has a much clearer understanding regarding the complexity of multiple relationships and has made changes in the process of her practice, changes in her forms and now talks with clients up front regarding boundary violations. She stated that she found a book that the Board might be interested in called "Thank you but I can't accept that from you."

Dr. Czajkowski stated that she still works with infertility clients only and has made very extensive forms regarding being an egg donor.

Dr. Czajkowski stated that she read "Ethical Conflicts in Psychology" which is an 18 CE credit hour course that is sponsored by APA. She stated that she also read "Can't We Meet at Starbucks?" for 3 credit hours. Dr. Czajkowski asked the Board to accept all 21 credit hours of CE.

Ms. Taxin referred to the Stipulation and Order and reminded the Board that Dr. Czajkowski is to complete 10 hours of CE with an emphasis in ethics, values, boundaries and transference/counter-transference.

Dr. Carpenter stated that he is familiar with the 18 hour course of "Ethical Conflicts in Psychology" and it is a good course.

Dr. Malovich asked if the 10 hours of approve CE are in addition to the required 48 hours of CE for renewal of the license.

Ms. Taxin and the Board responded that Dr. Malovich is correct.

Dr. Malovich made a motion to accept 10 hours of the 18 hours CE in "Ethical Conflicts in Psychology" as meeting the CE requirement of Dr. Czajkowski's Stipulation and Order.

Dr. Carpenter seconded the motion.

Ms. Buhler asked if the balance of hours will count toward the regular 48 hours of CE.

The Board responded that Dr. Czajkowski may count the balance of the hours for her regular required CE.

Following the discussion, the Board vote was unanimous.

Dr. Malovich informed Dr. Czajkowski that a therapy report has not been received. She asked Dr. Czajkowski to update the Board regarding therapy.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that her therapist is trying to educate her on personality traits, the types of clientele that she has normally been seeing, that personalities are different and how they relate to other clients Dr. Czajkowski has seen. She stated that she works with high risk clients and she was not responding to their behaviors. She stated that she has focused recently on self care activities and self criticism. Dr. Czajkowski stated that her therapist is helping her focus on her response to the whole emotional situation of having her license sanctioned and being on probation.

Dr. Malovich asked if it has been stressful and emotional.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that it has. She stated that she has an appointment on Friday with the therapist and they usually meet every week or every other week. She stated that she meets with Dr. King, her supervisor, every week and Dr. King has encouraged her to keep a sort of journal and write more about what she thinks about all the issues. She stated that she and Dr. King discussed the book "Ethical Conflicts in Psychology" and looked at the issues together. Dr. Czajkowski stated that the focus has been on her clients and it has been a positive experience.

Dr. Malovich stated that Dr. Czajkowski has been

doing therapy for a long period of time. She asked if she is doing anything different now.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that she is listening more and developing some new skills and trying some new approaches. She stated that she has tried a new direction with one client and it was very effective. She stated that she is also reflecting on how it feels to her personally.

Dr. Merryweather asked if the supervision with Dr. King is meeting her needs.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that it is. She stated that she is fortunate to working with Dr. King.

Dr. Carpenter stated that Dr. Czajkowski indicated at her last appointment that there were stresses in her life that may have crossed over into her therapy sessions. He asked Dr. Czajkowski to respond.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that she has mentioned the stresses to her therapist and they have talked about them.

Dr. Carpenter asked if she will be able to put those stresses behind her or how will she deal with stresses in the future.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that her goal is to put it behind her. She stated that she is now more inclined to make dramatic changes in terms of seeing people if the external factors become more significant.

Dr. Carpenter stated that it is like an impaired physician. He asked if she would stop seeing clients for awhile if she recognized she was becoming too stressed.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that she did stop seeing clients for awhile when the stress was at its height. She stated that her daughter is also a stressor for her as she has been going through some things.

Dr. Harper commented that it takes some skills and

backbone to make hard choices.

Dr. Malovich stated that therapy is to identify factors that you can control. She asked Dr. Czajkowski what things she can control.

Dr. Czajkowski responded that one area she has control over is her daughter as her daughter is more on top of her own situation and does not resent such extreme changes. She stated that she has more support through this process from her colleagues and friends. She stated that is managing her own health and medication better and has not had any outbreaks. Dr. Czajkowski stated that she is taking the breaks she needs for her own health. She stated that she is trying to implement the things she can control and her therapist, Dr. Roberts, is only a phone call away. She stated that Dr. Roberts is usually receptive to get her in quickly. She stated that recently she has spoken up for herself and started to decline certain clients and to say no to things she is asked to do.

Dr. Czajkowski stated that Dr. Grosser will be stepping down as the Department chair and Dr. McMann is the person who will be the new chair. She stated that Dr. Grosser would like to continue to be the person who monitors her in the Department for the continuity.

Ms. Taxin thanked Dr. Czajkowski for sharing the information and she asked Dr. Czajkowski to notify the Board if Dr. Grosser determines he will not supervise her due to his employment resignation as she needs to have the employer supervision.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Czajkowski is on track with her Stipulation and Order requirements and has completed the CE requirement. She stated that the therapist will need to submit a report within the next few weeks and another one prior to the July 31, 2007 Board meeting as they are due quarterly. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. King's reports must continue to be submitted monthly.

Dr. Haas informed Dr. Czajkowski that this will be

Dr. Carpenter's last meeting as he has completed his years of service on the Board.

An appointment was made for Dr. Czajkowski to meet again October 2, 2007.

FYI

Ms. Taxin updated the Board on Dr. Bjornson. She stated that he called her about 5:00 pm on Thursday regarding approval for an independent project with Dr. Zur. She stated that she left a message for Dr. Bjornson about 5:30 requesting him to submit a syllabi regarding the project so she would know what they were going to cover. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Bjornson called Ms. McCall on Friday to let her know he had faxed the outline. She stated that she had another message on Saturday from Dr. Bjornson telling her not to review the information for Dr. Zur as his fee was making it prohibitive for Dr. Bjornson to do the project with Dr. Zur. She stated that the message also stated that Dr. Bjornson would be researching other options and get back to her. Ms. Taxin stated that the message concluded with Dr. Bjornson stating he and his family have had a lot of grief due to the passing of his father.

Ms. Taxin stated that she received another phone message on Tuesday, May 29, 2007, stating that he had been really busy but did contact Dan Tao, a professor at Alliant University, who agreed to do some ethics training. Ms. Taxin stated that about 5:00 pm she received another phone call with an apology for the last minute chaos and stating that Dr. Bjornson may need to request additional time to complete the CE requirement. She stated that the message stated that Dr. Bjornson would be calling her today, May 30, 2007. Ms. Taxin stated that she again called Dr. Bjornson back and left the message that May 31, 2007 was his deadline and he would need to submit a syllabi by 8:45 am or he could stop by the Division and meet with the Board.

Ms. Taxin informed the Board that May 31, 2007 is his deadline to complete the CE. She stated that the intent of the CE is for the licensee to learn. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Czajkowski completed her CE and shared with the Board that it was a learning experience

and a good experience. She stated that she is concerned about Dr. Bjornson's intent regarding just trying to complete the requirement or is he intending to learn something by completing the requirement.

Dr. Haas remarked that the Board has already made a recommendation to Ms. Taxin to do an Order to Show Cause.

Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Bjornson has worked hard to obtain his license and it is a huge issue to take it away as a license is his livelihood. She stated that Ms. McCall called Dr. Bjornson and wrote him a letter after the last Board meeting that outlined what is expected of him and the May 31, 2007 deadline to complete the CE. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Bjornson has had some real issues regarding completing his CE requirement and she asked the Board if they would approve him to complete the same 18 hour ethics course that Dr. Czajkowski completed. She stated that he could not complete it in one day and suggested he be given until the July 31, 2007 Board meeting.

Dr. Haas asked Ms. McCall to read the letter she sent Dr. Bjornson after the last meeting.

Ms. McCall read the letter.

Dr. Hass responded that he would be willing to wait until the July 31, 2007 meeting for Dr. Bjornson to complete his CE and then ask him at the appointment if he has completed the requirement.

Ms. Taxin stated that she has an issue with Dr. Bjornson continuing to work and continuing to be out of compliance with the Stipulation and Order.

Dr. Carpenter stated that if the Board requests an Order to Show Cause for non-compliance with the CE requirement that Dr. Bjornson will probably come to a hearing and say that he has completed the CE.

Ms. Taxin asked if Dr. Bjornson is a danger to the public. She stated that if he is putting off completing

the CE requirement and not taking the Order seriously she wonders if he is keeping boundaries and practicing ethically.

Dr. Carpenter stated that if the issue is to get Dr. Bjornson to complete the required CE, he wondered if that would be a justification to do an Order to Show Cause.

Dr. Haas asked if Dr. Carpenter had an alternative idea for the Board to consider.

Dr. Carpenter responded that he did not have an alternative idea for the Board to consider he just wanted to discuss ideas.

Ms. Taxin asked again if the Board wanted Dr. Bjornson to complete the 18 hour course that Dr. Czajkowski completed.

Dr. Haas responded that he wanted Dr. Bjornson to attend a live face to face CE course and stated no to the 18 hour course.

Dr. Merryweather stated that he would propose that the Board move forward with the Order to Show Cause. He stated that it would have been appropriate at the last meeting to outline the specific requirements and to uphold those requirements at this meeting. He stated that, if nothing else, Dr. Bjornson will have completed the requirement. He stated that doing an Order to Show Cause and having a hearing will give a clear message that the Board is finished with extensions.

Ms. Taxin stated that if Dr. Bjornson submits something today she will call Dr. Haas.

Dr. Hass asked if the Board will have to schedule a special meeting.

Ms. Taxin responded that the Board has given her the direction they want her go and she will do an Order to Show Cause.

Ms. Buhler asked if Dr. Bjornson completed the first 16 hours of CE in a timely manner.

Dr. Haas responded that Dr. Bjornson did complete the first 16 hours of CE in a timely manner.

Dr. Malovich asked how Dr. Bjornson will be notified of the Order to Show Cause.

Ms. Taxin responded that he will receive notification from the Division's attorneys and/or judge as it is a legal document requiring him to appear for a hearing.

9:45 A.M.

Rules Review and Writing Session

Dr. Haas stated that he would also like to review the CE requirements and the application after the Rules have been reviewed.

Ms. Taxin explained that she tried to incorporate the things the Board and Dr. Carpenter recommended. She stated that she needs some assistance on the definition of the Pre-Doctoral Internship under R156-61-102(6).

Dr. Haas stated that the Rules seem to have a lot of redundancy. He asked who is qualified to supervise pre-doctoral and post-doctoral experience.

Dr. Carpenter responded that there is a hardship for faculty to supervise the pre-doctoral hours and the post-doctoral hours due to the time frame to get licensed and then adding 2 years of licensed practice.

Dr. Haas stated that faculty supervisors should have the 2 years of experience as practitioners to be qualified to supervise. He stated that if someone teaches a practicum and sees one or two clients over the semester in a non-clinical setting he would not want the hours to count toward the required 4000 hours of supervised experience.

Dr. Carpenter stated that Dr. Haas scenario has not been defined before. He asked if the Board

would count the faculty person's experience toward the required hours for licensure.

Dr. Haas asked who is qualified to supervise. He asked if Dr. Carpenter would count 2000 hours of internship and 2000 hours under supervision of a licensed faculty that had only one year of experience.

Dr. Carpenter responded that the faculty may supervise but the hours won't count unless the faculty meets all the requirements for a supervisor.

Dr. Haas stated that the Division will have to do the research on this issue.

Dr. Carpenter stated that it does take time to obtain the required 4000 hours. He stated that it is the expectation of the University that graduates get their license within one year and pick up supervision duties when they get licensed.

Dr. Haas responded that the whole section should be taken out of the Rules.

Dr. Carpenter explained that if the section is deleted from the Rules the junior faculty would not be able to supervise.

Dr. Haas responded that they would not be able to supervise the practicum.

Dr. Carpenter responded that Dr. Haas is correct. He stated that he is proposing the duties of the supervisor be included in the Rules.

Ms. Taxin stated that this section does not relate to the Law change. She stated that the Board could work on the specific areas and then return to this section at a later date.

Dr. Haas commented that he would like some time to rework this area.

Ms. Taxin asked the Board to review R156-61-102(4) regarding "Supervised psychology training", as used

in subsection 58-61-304(1)(e), means practical training experiences providing hands-on clinical psychology services. In addition to the scope of practice outlined in Subsection 58-61-101(8)(9); full-time internships and post doctoral residency positions duties devoted to mental health therapy delivery are acceptable. Ms. Taxin asked if the Board accepted this definition.

Dr. Haas and Dr. Merryweather responded that they do not understand what “hands on” means.

Dr. Carpenter recommended “hands on” be changed to “providing direct clinical services”.

The board agreed.

Ms. Taxin stated that she will make the change. She explained that she tried to minimize Dr. Carpenter’s definitions as the Rules should be short and concise when possible for people to read and understand.

The Board requested Dr. Carpenter’s original definition be read.

Ms. Taxin read the definition as follows:
“Supervised Psychology training,” as used in Subsection 58-61-304(1)(e), means practical training experiences in providing the actual services of a professional psychologist. All activities in full-time internships and in full-time postdoctoral positions devoted solely to mental health delivery are acceptable. For all other experiences the only acceptable activities are those included in the practice of psychology (defined in Subsections 58-61-101(8) and (9)), usually through face-to-face interaction, as well as the supervision and other professional activities (e.g., record keeping) required of that professional activity. Other activities not directly related to the practice of psychology, even if commonly performed by psychologists, do not count; examples of ineligible activities include psychology course work, analog clinical activities (e.g., role plays), activities required for business purposes (e.g., billing), supervision of others engaged in activities other than practice of psychology (e.g., supervising adolescents in wilderness settings), and activities

commonly performed by non-psychologists (e.g., teaching of psychology on topics not of a professional psychology nature).

Dr. Haas and Dr. Carpenter responded that the original language should be used.

Ms. Taxin responded that the language is not legally written as Dr. Carpenter has put in examples.

Dr. Haas asked what happens after the Board completes the draft.

Ms. Taxin responded that she makes the recommended changes and submits the document to Ray Walker, the Regulation and Compliance Officer, to review. She stated that after she revises from Mr. Walker's recommendations, the document goes to Masuda Medcalf, the Administrative Law Judge, and then to another attorney to review. She stated that she usually has revisions after each review.

Dr. Haas asked if Ms. Taxin believes Dr. Carpenter's language will be rejected.

Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Carpenter's suggestions are quite lengthy. She stated that she will write it as Dr. Carpenter suggested.

Ms. Taxin asked the Board to review R156-102(5) which reads "Program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation", as used in Subsection R156-61-302a(1), is the actual program accredited at the time of completion of the doctoral psychology degree. No other program at the degree granting institution is considered accredited, and in no case are departments or institutions of higher education considered accredited." She stated that this definition is about the same as Dr. Carpenter suggested.

Dr. Carpenter recommended Ms. Taxin check the official name for the accreditation title as accreditation has changed recently. He stated that some students believe they have an accredited degree when only a specific program is accredited.

Dr. Haas recommended the language “Specific Named Program that is accredited at the time.”

Dr. Carpenter responded that BYU has a clinical program that is accredited and another psychology program that is not clinical and is not accredited. He stated that the students in both programs believe both are accredited.

Dr. Haas stated that there is a Sports Psychology program at the University of Utah that is not an accredited Psychology program.

Ms. Taxin asked the Board to review R156-102(6) regarding the pre-doctoral internship which reads “Predoctoral internship”, is a formal program of clinical psychology training”. She then read Dr. Carpenter’s recommendation which reads: “Predoctoral internship,” refers to a formal program of training including a full-time, one-year (or half-time, two-year) experience offered to culminate the doctoral degree training in clinical, counseling, or school psychology. Such programs meet the minimum requirements of the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC). Ad hoc training experiences or other practica, even if labeled as internships, do not qualify.”

Dr. Carpenter commented that there are School Psychologists who are licensed.

Ms. Taxin stated that her understanding is that the Psychology license is for clinical Psychology and not for the School Psychologist.

Dr. Haas responded that the Division would have a legal issue if it was challenged by an applicant.

Ms. Taxin explained that someone from the Board of Education met with her and explained that School Psychology does not include mental health therapy courses as they focus on School Psychology only.

Ms. Taxin again read Dr. Carpenter’s definition.

Dr. Haas stated that APA has taken the School

Psychology education and called it a Professional Psychology education.

Ms. Taxin asked if the education needs to be APPAIC approved or equivalent.

Dr. Carpenter responded that the education does need to be APPAIC approved or equivalent. He stated that all APA accredited programs are APPAIC programs but they are not required to be.

Dr. Haas suggested the Board review those issues that are pertinent at this time and review other areas later.

Ms. Taxin read Dr. Carpenter's recommendation for respecialization which reads: "An applicant whose doctoral degree training is not designed to lead to practice or who wishes to practice in a substantially different area than the training of the doctoral degree may complete a formal respecialization program (See Subsection R156-61-102(6)) to meet requirements (f), (g), and (j) through (m) above of this Subsection. The options under Subsection R156-61-302a(3) shall not apply.

Ms. Taxin asked if re-specialization is referred to in the Law.

Dr. Carpenter responded that it is not referred to in the Law. He stated that if someone obtains a degree in Psychology and then goes back to complete a program of study that skips the fundamentals of Psychology and the dissertation but focuses on the clinical coursework for 5 to 8 courses and then completes the practica and internship, most States will issue the Psychology license without any hesitation. He stated that Utah routinely violates the Rule by licensing applicants who obtain courses somewhere. He stated that the University says they are retaining these people and set up the additional courses they will need. Dr. Carpenter stated that there is no degree issued at the completion of the courses. He explained that one individual had a degree in General Psychology with an emphasis in Research Psychology. He

stated that this individual took a position with developmentally disabled, worked under supervision and was issued a Psychology license without taking any applied ethics classes or a practicum.

Dr. Merryweather responded that respecialization courses would be for a non-practicing clinical Psychologist taking additional clinical classes to be licensed as a practicing clinical Psychologist.

Ms. Taxin read R156-302a(f) of the proposed Rules which reads: “have an organized and clearly identified sequence of study to provide an integrated educational experience appropriate to preparation for the professional practice of psychology and licensure and shall clearly identify those persons responsible for the program with clear authority and responsibility for the core and specialty areas regardless of whether or not the program cuts across administrative lines in the educational institution.”

Dr. Carpenter responded that R156-302a(f) of the proposed Rules will cover his concerns for respecialization.

Ms. Taxin referred the Board to R156-302a(3) of the proposed Rules which reads: “The date of completion of the doctoral degree shall be the graduation date listed on the official transcript.” Ms. Taxin explained that this clarification will eliminate many questions from applicants asking if they can submit an application when the coursework is completed.

Dr. Carpenter commented that the Division/Board will need to be sure applicants cannot register for the examination until after that graduation date.

Ms. Taxin responded that a complete application must be submitted and reviewed for approval to the examination. She explained that the transcript with the degree posted must be on the transcript when the application is submitted. Ms. Taxin stated that a letter of approval to sit for the examination is sent out after the complete application is reviewed.

Ms. Taxin moved on to R156-302b. Qualifications for Licensure – Experience Requirements, Section (1)(a), which reads: “Psychology training of a minimum of 4,000 hours qualifying an applicant for licensure as a psychologist under Subsection 58-61-304(1)(e), and mental health therapy training under Subsection 58-61-304(1)(f), to be approved by the division in collaboration with the board, shall: (a) be completed in not less than two years and in not more than four years following the awarding of the degree unless otherwise approved by the board and division.”

Ms. Buhler requested Ms. Taxin to insert doctoral degree so that (a) will read: “be completed in not less than two years and in not more than four years following the awarding of the doctoral degree unless otherwise approved by the board and division.”

Dr. Carpenter recommended the hours to be accrued or to be completed in not more than 40 hours a week for any full time pre-doctoral internship and post-doctoral training and experience and not more than 20 hours per week for any other pre-doctoral training experience. He explained that the 40 hours first addresses the full time internship and the 20 hours addresses the practicum. He stated that the Board wants the internship to be actual training.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302b(b), (c), (d), and (2).

The Board agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302b(3) and explained that an applicant for licensure may accrue any portion of the 4000 hours in a pre-doctoral program.

The Board agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on to R156-61-302b(4).

Dr. Carpenter recommended R156-61-302b(4) be deleted from the proposed Rules.

Ms. Taxin moved on to R156-61-302b(5) which reads: “An applicant that completes the 4000 hours in a pre-doctoral program will qualify for a Psychologist License, not a Psychology Resident License.” Ms. Taxin explained that her intent is to clarify that if the 4000 hours are completed pre-doctorally the applicant qualifies for the Psychology license as the Psychology Resident license is issued for obtaining the hours. She stated that graduates who have completed their 4000 hours want to work as a Psychology Resident but do not want to take the EPPP and/or Utah Law and Rules examination right away.

Dr. Haas voiced concern in forcing graduates who have the hours to take the examinations right away. He explained that there are people who want to do research and work under a grant prior to going into clinical practice. He stated that those people should be allowed to wait to take the examination.

Dr. Carpenter responded that he believes anyone who has completed 3000 hours of their supervision requirement should be approved to take the examinations. He stated that the Law requires graduation before approval to sit for the examinations. Dr. Carpenter stated that there will be those who don’t want to take the examinations and there will be those who will be motivated to apply for the Psychology Resident license.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Law cannot be changed right now.

Dr. Carpenter recommended in number (5) remove the word “pre-doctoral”.

Dr. Haas recommended Ms. Taxin include the word “who” in number (5) so that it would read “An applicant who” with the remainder of the language as Dr. Carpenter recommended.

Ms. Taxin moved on to the R156-61-302c. Qualifications for Licensure – Examination Requirements, Section (1) (b), (2) and (3).

The board agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302c. Qualifications for Licensure – Examination Requirements, Section (4) which reads: “An applicant who fails the EPPP examination three times will not be allowed subsequent admission to the examination until the applicant has appeared before the board, developed with the board a plan of study in appropriate subject matter, and thereafter completed the planned course of study to the satisfaction of the board.”

Board member stated that the language appears to prohibit the Board from denying an applicant who fails the EPPP examination 3 times by allowing them to continue to retake the examination if they give the Board a reasonable proposal.

Ms. Taxin explained that there are qualified applicants that have failed the EPPP examination several times who have disabilities and/or valid responses for the failure but have not requested ADA accommodations. She stated that sometimes applicants are reluctant to ask for accommodations until they have failed several times.

Dr. Merryweather responded that failing the examination shows there are glaring gaps in training which would indicate that applicants are not qualified.

Ms. Taxin suggested the maybe the Rules say that the EPPP examination can only be taken 5 times.

Dr. Haas recommended the Rule read: “An applicant who fails the EPPP examination three times will only be allowed 1 subsequent admission to the examination after the applicant has appeared before the board, developed with the board a plan of study in appropriate subject matter, and thereafter completed the planned course of study to the satisfaction of the board.

Board members agreed with Dr. Haas’ recommendation.

Ms. Taxin voiced concern with the 4 times Rule which doesn't accommodate for possible future licensure options.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302c(5).

The Board agreed with the proposed Rule.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302c(6) and explained that she recommends this be deleted from the Rules.

Board members agreed to delete Section (6)

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302e. Duties and Responsibilities of a Supervisor of Psychology Training and Mental Health Therapist Training, Section (1).

The Board agreed with the proposed Rule.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302e(1)(b).

The Board agreed with the proposed Rule.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302e(1), Section (c) which reads: "be completed in not more than 20 hours per week for a pre-doctoral training and experience program and no more than 40 hours per week for any post-doctoral training and experience".

The Board agreed with the proposed Rule.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302e(3) which reads: "An applicant for licensure may accrue the 4000 hours of psychology doctoral degree training and experience required in 58-61-304(1)(e) in a pre-doctoral program".

Board members recommended it be changed to read: "An applicant for licensure may accrue not more than 20 hours of supervision per week for the 4000 hours of psychology doctoral degree training and experience required in 58-61-304(1)(e) in a pre-doctoral program in a training experience authorized by the educational program".

LUNCH BREAK FROM 12:00 PM TO 12:50 PM

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302e, Section (9) which reads: "Ensure that the supervisee is certified by the division as a psychology resident or enrolled in a psychology pre-doctoral program".

Board members recommended Section (9) read: "Ensure that the supervisee is certified by the division as a psychology resident or enrolled in a psychology pre-doctoral program in a training experience authorized by the educational program".

Ms. Taxin recommended that a Section 10 be added that will read: The supervisor does not supervise beyond their competence, expertise or education.

Dr. Carpenter commented that supervisors supervise activities they are not qualified to do and/or have expertise.

Dr. Merryweather asked what constitutes expertise.

Dr. Haas stated that he has had Psychology Residents who have challenged him when he has requested they tape their sessions for him to review.

Ms. Taxin recommended Section 10 be deleted.

Board members agreed that Section 10 should be deleted.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302h. Continuing Education, Section (5) which reads: "Credit for professional education shall be recognized in accordance with the following: (d) a maximum of ten hours per two year period may be recognized for internet or distance learning courses which include an examination, a completion certificate and recognized by the American Psychological Association or a state or province psychological association".

Dr. Carpenter commented that one problem with distance learning is that there is no attendance.

Dr. Haas recommended the language be “no more than ten hours per two year period may be recognized for internet or distance learning courses which meet the criteria under Section 4”.

Dr. Merryweather stated that ASPPB suggests no more than half the CE be not face-to-face CE. He stated that ten hours would be less than half and should be acceptable. He stated that he would also recommend that there be a requirement of 3 hours per year for ethics and Psychology Law. Dr. Merryweather stated that malpractice insurance organizations are giving discounts for documenting 3 hours per year in ethics and Psychology Law.

Ms. Taxin stated that she will include a minimum of 3 hours per year in ethics and Psychology Law will be required.

Dr. Carpenter recommended it be added under R156-61-302h (2) and (c).

Dr. Merryweather stated that he would like to increase the number of hours in distance learning to 15 or 20 hours in the 2 year period. He explained that there are opportunities on the internet and other venues that are available if they are recognized by APA or a State Association that do require an examination.

Ms. Taxin asked for a specific number of hours as courses are generally 3, 6, 12 or 18 hours.

Dr. Merryweather recommended 18 hours.

Board members concurred.

Ms. Taxin moved on the R156-61-302h(5)(e) which reads: “a maximum of six hours per two year period may be recognized for peer supervision, review and meeting which are documented noting the above requirements in Section (4)”.

Dr. Haas asked how someone documents peer supervision.

Ms. Taxin responded that the licensed Psychologist would have to show due diligence with formal documentation and which is organized and documented on a standard form. She stated that the CE should be meaningful and someone who is short hours should not be allowed to meet with the supervisor for a few hours one-on-one to complete the hours. She stated that the leader of the group would have to provide verification of the peer supervision's time, date and subject as the other CE requires.

Dr. Merryweather commented that other States have an agenda, an attendance roster and a certificate of completion.

Board members agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on to R156-61-502. Unprofessional Conduct, Section (20) and informed the Board that she included post-doctoral experience so that it now reads: "participating in a residency program without being certified as a psychology resident for post-doctoral training and experience".

Board members agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on to Section (21) and informed the Board that she will delete post-doctoral training and experience.

Board members agreed with the proposed language.

Ms. Taxin moved on to Section (22) which reads: "practicing beyond one's competence as demonstrated by both formal education and supervised experience".

Dr. Carpenter commented that just because the Law says they can practice Psychology does not necessarily mean that they are qualified to practice.

Board members agreed with the proposed language.

Dr. Carpenter stated that he proposed changes to R156-61-302a in regard to education requirements. He asked why those proposed changes were not included in Ms. Taxin's document of proposed Rules.

Ms. Taxin responded that she reviewed Dr. Carpenter's proposals and tried to incorporate his language as best she could.

Dr. Carpenter referred to the re-specialization area. He and Dr. Haas requested the re-specialization information be included in the proposed Rules.

Dr. Carpenter made a motion to adopt the Rules with the corrections requested today.

Dr. Malovich seconded the motion.

The Board vote was unanimous.

Ms. Taxin stated that she will make the corrections and mail them out to the Board for a final review before she files them. She stated that if there are a lot of responses and discussion after the corrections are made the Board may have to meet again to finalize the proposed Rules before she can file them for a Rules Hearing. Ms. Taxin stated that if there are few responses she might be able to schedule a Hearing in next few months.

Ms. Taxin reminded the Board that Dr. Carpenter's term of office as a Board member will end June 30, 2007. She asked if the Board if they are comfortable inviting Dr. Carpenter to continue to participate with writing the Rules.

Board members voice approval for Dr. Carpenter to continue working with them on the Rules.

Dr. Haas recommended the Board move on to reviewing the application as there are items in the

application that may require additional changes in the Rules.

Dr. Haas requested Dr. Carpenter to explain his proposal for the application.

Dr. Carpenter explained that he proposed the application include sections of the Laws and/or Rules that outlines step by step the education requirements, examination requirements and licensing requirements. He stated that he separated out the Psychology Resident requirements from the Psychologist requirements. He stated that he has included examples in his proposed application to assist in clarification of areas that appear to be problematic for applicants.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Division has developed a standard for applications with specific things that each applicant has to fill out and/or sign. She stated that there are some areas that she might be able to change but there will be some areas that cannot be changed. She stated that she will review the proposed application with the proper Division personnel and see what she can do.

Dr. Haas asked if transcripts have to be submitted for the Psychology Resident application and again for the Psychology application.

Ms. Taxin responded that if the Psychology Resident license was issued several years ago the applicant for Psychology may have to submit the transcripts again as they might not be entered into the electronic file on the computer, otherwise on a regular basis Psychology Residents are not required to do so.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Laws and Rules examination information regarding registering with Thomson Prometric will need to be deleted and questions put into the application. She asked if the Board would like the application to indicate that if an applicant is approved for the EPPP examination and the Utah Law and Rule examination a letter will be sent to the applicant.

The Board requested the application indicate that a letter is sent when approved for the examinations.

Dr. Haas recommended Ms. Taxin review the proposed application with the Division personnel and note that the Board is recommending the format.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR: July 31, 2007

ADJOURN: Motion to adjourn by Dr. Carpenter. Ms. Buhler seconded the motion. **The Board vote was unanimous.**

The time is 2:27 pm and the meeting is adjourned.

Note: These minutes are not intended to be a verbatim transcript but are intended to record the significant features of the business conducted in this meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily shown in the chronological order they occurred.

September 26, 2007
Date Approved

(ss) Natalie Malovich
Chairperson, Utah Psychology Licensing Board

August 6, 2007
Date Approved

(ss) Noel Taxin
Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational &
Professional Licensing